



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/24/3340630

7 Carrigans, Bishops Stortford CM23 2SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs N and K Cook against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/23/2337/HH, dated 5 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Proposed double storey side extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a split level two storey detached dwelling with a gabled elevation facing the street as it bends. The ridge is towards the western end so that the main roof is significantly narrower to this side of it than the other. Consequently, the property has a particularly distinctive asymmetrical form with the ridge being perpendicular to the front elevation. The street is characterised by similar properties in the vicinity that form a distinct group, giving a pleasant and attractive degree of consistency to this part.
4. The proposal is to extend the dwelling to the eastern side at two storey height. The addition would have a lower ridge height than the main roof of the host dwelling and be set back at the front with a hipped roof. However, it would have a fairly lengthy ridge parallel to the front elevation with a significant amount of roofslope directly facing the street. This would be a particularly unusual feature, providing an unacceptable and jarring contrast with the characteristic roof form within the group of properties.
5. Furthermore, the front wall of the extension would be about half the width of that of the existing property. Moreover, the overall length of the roof of the addition from the westernmost end of its ridge to the eaves of the hipped end would be broadly the same as that of the existing property. In these

- circumstances rather than being subservient to the host dwelling, the extension would be overly dominant.
6. The asymmetric front gable would remain apparent with the pitch of the hipped roof and facing materials matching those of the existing property. However, the detrimental effects I have described would occur anyway, with the original part of the dwelling being seen in a somewhat awkward juxtaposition with the uncharacteristic and unduly extensive roofscape of the addition.
 7. For these reasons, and even though not located within a Conservation Area or concerning a Listed Building, it is concluded that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and the streetscene. As a result, there would be conflict with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 and Policy HDP2 of the Bishops Stortford Town Council Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Silverleys and Meads Wards 2021-2033.
 8. Taken together and, among other things, these policies intend that development should achieve a high standard of design, reflect and promote local distinctiveness while being of a form, design and size appropriate to the existing dwelling, setting and area. Extensions should also generally appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling. Policy HDP3 of the NP is concerned with matters that are not in dispute in this appeal and is therefore not relevant in this instance.
 9. In the National Planning Policy Framework it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include that the proposed development should add to the overall quality of the area, as well as being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.
 10. The Town Council has raised no objections to the proposal. Nevertheless, this does not, in itself, confer acceptability on the proposal and I must consider this appeal on its own merits.
 11. Taking account of all other matters raised and given the harm that would result the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR